



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,468	01/22/2004	Patrick A. Wochnick	6486-67123	6666

24197 7590 06/16/2006  
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP  
121 SW SALMON STREET  
SUITE 1600  
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

WUJCIAK, ALFRED J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3632

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/763,468

Applicant(s)

WOCHNICK, PATRICK A.

Examiner

Alfred Joseph Wujciak III

Art Unit

3632

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-10,14-22 and 31-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-10,14-22 and 31-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

This is the third non-final office action for the serial number 10/763,468, PIPE SUPPORT APPARATUS, filed on 1/22/04.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 14-22 and 31-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 17, line 19, "base portion" is indefinite because in claim 17, line 17 claimed "an end cap" which is considered as base in the supplementary connector. Claim 17 is claiming two separated bases for one piece of the supplementary connector.

Claim 34, line 13, "base portion" is indefinite because in claim 34, line 11 claimed "an end cap" which is considered as base in the supplementary connector. Claim 34 is claiming two separated bases for one piece of the supplementary connector.

Claims 14-16 and 18-22 are rejected as depending on rejected claim 17. Claims 31-33 and 35-39 are rejected as depending on rejected claim 34.

***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection

Art Unit: 3632

is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 14-22, 31-39 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent No. 6,685,144 in view of US Patent # 485,033 to Hanna.

Patent '144 teaches flexible strap, latching mechanism, base member, elongated support member, supplementary connector having cavity and end cap. The connector is adhesively secured to the support member. The latching mechanism having a bearing member.

Patent '144 teaches the connector but fails to teach the connector having first and second walls. Hanna teaches the connector (12) having first and second walls and one of the walls are removable.. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added walls to Patent '144 connector as taught by Hanna to provide support for connector to remain connected to the elongated support member.

In regards to claim 22, Patent'144 in view of Hanna teaches the first wall section but fails to teach the first wall section extends in an arc in a range from 185 to 210 degrees. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the wall section arc in range from 185 to 210 degrees to provide designer's preference for the degrees of arc in the first wall section.

Claims 8-10 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent No. 6,685,144 in view of US Patent # 4,767,087 to Comu.

Patent'144 teaches flexible strap, latching mechanism, base member, elongated support member, supplementary connector having cavity and end cap. The connector is adhesively secured to the support member. The base and supplementary connector having interengaging positioning elements. The diverging side portions of the base member and slot have complementary dove-tail shaped configurations.

Patent'144 teaches the interengaging positioning elements but fails to teach the base member having projection and the supplementary connector having detent. Furthermore, Patent'144 fails to teach the holes in base and supplementary connector are aligned to each other. Comu teaches the base member (13) having projection (on each corner of element 13) and the supplementary connector (2) having detent (12). Comu teaches the base member having hole and supplementary connector having hole and they are aligned to each other. It would have been

Art Unit: 3632

obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added holes, projection and detent to Patent '144 base and connector as taught by Comu to provide additional security for the base to remain connected to the supplementary connector.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8-10, 14-22 and 31-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alfred Joseph Wujciak III whose telephone number is (571) 272-6827. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (571) 272-6815. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alfred Joseph Wujciak III  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3632  
6/9/06

